



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/801,411	03/08/2001	Darrell Lee Ash	RFMI01-00213	2885

7590

03/26/2003

William J. Munck, Esq.
Novakov Davis & Munck, P.C.
900 Three Galleria Tower
13155 Noel Road
Dallas, TX 75240

EXAMINER

KINKEAD, ARNOLD M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2817

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/801,411

Applicant(s)

ASH, DARRELL LEE

Examiner

Arnold M Kinhead

Art Unit

2817

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-10 and 12-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 and 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.


Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: 

Art Unit: 2817

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 6,7,13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 6 and 13, the load impedance is lower than the stray capacitance impedance...is this recitation correct? Where is this supported?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

I. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a

Art Unit: 2817

U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

II. Claims 1,5,8,12,15,16,18,19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Northam(US 6,239,664).

The reference by Northam, figure 2, and col. 7, lines 34-42, discloses an oscillator circuit with a SAW resonator (figure 2, 202) with inductor element (230,235), and varactor (244, variable tuning cap). The amplifier (204) is also shown. Low phase noise is achieved by tuning out the stray capacitances. The method steps being inherent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

III. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

IV. Claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Driscoll(US pat. 5,608,360) of record and further in view of Northam.

The reference by Driscoll discloses an oscillator circuit that makes use of a SAW resonator(see figure 1, and col. 3, lines 5-20) which provides the suggestion that it is known in the art that SAWR's have a certain amount of parasitic capacitance that may be tuned out. The two port resonator(input and output ports) is shown coupled with inductors (12,13). A load is connected to the output.

The reference does not explicitly describe the inductors as tuning out the parasitic capacitance nor does it show a tunable SAW resonator with varactor. The method steps being inherent.

With regard to the latter idea it is notoriously well known in the art that a resonator maybe made adjustable by adding a varactor that allows for tuning adjustments, see the reference by Northam, figure 2, and col. 7, lines 34-42. The reference by Northam discloses an oscillator circuit with a SAW resonator(figure 2, 202) with inductor element(230,235), and varactor(244, variable tuning cap). The amplifier(204) is also shown. Low phase noise is achieved by tuning out the stray capacitances. Also, the use of the inductor elements would have been recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art to have a role in tuning out the parasitics. The inductors coupled to ground.

In light of the above it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the SAW resonator as shown in Driscoll to include a varactor control, as shown by Northam, to allow for the tuning of the resonator as desired. Also, the inductors allowing for compensation against the inherent parasitic capacitances.

Response to Arguments

V. Applicant's arguments with respect to the capacitor 226, is not understood; the examiner is relying on variable cap 244 coupled to the input.

Allowable Subject Matter

VI. Claims 4 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

1. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2817

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arnold Kinhead whose telephone number is (703) 305-3486. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pascal, can be reached on (703) 308-4909. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7724.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Arnold Kinhead

March 20, 2003


ARNOLD KINHEAD
PRIMARY EXAMINER